UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/986,168	11/07/2001	Sandra S. Webb	BS00-340	4958

28970 7590 01/14/2005

SHAW PITTMAN
IP GROUP
1650 TYSONS BOULEVARD
SUITE 1300
MCLEAN, VA 22102

EXAMINER	
BETIT, JACOB F	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2164	

DATE MAILED: 01/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/986,168	WEBB ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jacob F. Betit	2164	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10 August 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-21 and 23-45* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-21 and 23-45* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *20040823*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1. In response to communications filed on 10-August-2004, claims 1, 14, 20, 26, and 30 are amended, and claim 22 is cancelled per applicant's request. Claims 1-21 and 23-45 are presently pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claim 1, 4, 20, 23, 30, 32-33, 37-38, and 41-42 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hogan (U.S. patent No. 5,692,132) in view of Saliba et al. (U.S. patent application publication No. 2001/0037315 A1).

As to claim 1, Hogan teaches a method for database registration (see abstract), the method comprising:

receiving a user identifier of a user (see column 5, line 66 through column 6, line 6);

sending a query to a first database based at least in part on the user identifier (see column 6, lines 7-11);

receiving a first data value from the first database, the first data value being associated with the user (see column 6, lines 11-13);

receiving a second data value from a data source, the second data value being associated with the user, the data source being different from the first database (see column 7, lines 22-28); and

storing the first data value and the second data value in a second database, the second database being different from the first database (see column 9, lines 40-53).

Hogan does not teach storing the first data value and the second data value in a second database such that the first data value from the first database and the second data value from the second data source are contained within the second database concurrently and persistently.

Saliba et al. teaches storing the first data value and the second data value in a second database such that the first data value from the first database and the second data value from the second data source are contained within the second database concurrently and persistently (see paragraphs 0099-0102, and see figure 12b, where it is known in the art that pop emails are held on the local computer until they are deleted and web email is held in the web cache folder until it is replaced or removed).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Hogan by the teachings of Saliba et al. because storing the first data value and the second data value in a second database such that the first data value from the first database and the second data value from the second data source are contained within the second database concurrently and persistently would allow the user to secure financial transactions using an email system that is already in use (see Saliba et al., abstract).

As to claim 4, Hogan as modified, teaches wherein receiving the second data value includes receiving the second data value via a computer (see Hogan column 7, lines 22-28).

As to claim 20, Hogan teaches a system for database registration (see abstract), the system comprising:

a first server including database registration instructions (see column 5, line 66 through column 6, line 20);

a first database coupled to the first server, the first database to store at least in part a first data value associated with a user (see column 6, line 13);

a computer coupled to the first server, the computer to receive a second data value associated with the user (see column 7, lines 22-28), the computer to receive the first data value from the first database (see column 6, lines 11-13); and

a second database coupled to the computer, the second database to receive the first data value and the second data value from the computer, the second database to store the first data value and the second data value (see column 9, lines 40-53).

Hogan does not teach the second database to store the first data value from the first database and the second data value are contained within the second database concurrently and persistently.

Saliba et al. teaches the second database to store the first data value from the first database and the second data value are contained within the second database concurrently and persistently (see paragraphs 0099-0102, and see figure 12b, where it is known in the art that pop

emails are held on the local computer until they are deleted and web email is held in the web cache folder until it is replaced or removed).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Hogan by the teachings of Saliba et al. because the second database to store the first data value from the first database and the second data value are contained within the second database concurrently and persistently would allow the user to secure financial transactions using an email system that is already in use (see Saliba et al., abstract).

As to claim 23, Hogan as modified, teaches wherein the first data value associated with the user includes a validated first data value associated with the user (see Hogan, column 5, line 66 through column 6, line 20).

As to claim 30, Hogan teaches a system for database registration (see abstract), the system comprising:

means for receiving a user identifier of a user (see column 5, line 66 through column 6, line 6);

means for sending a query to a first database based at least in part on the user identifier (see column 6, lines 7-11);

means for receiving a first data value from the first database, the first data value being associated with the user (see column 6, lines 11-13);

means for receiving a second data value from a data source, the second data value being associated with the user, the data source being different from the first database (see column 7, lines 22-28); and

means for storing the first data value and the second data value in a second database, the second database being different from the first database (see column 9, lines 40-53).

Hogan does not teach means for storing the first data value and the second data value in a second database such that the first data value from the first database and the second data value from the data source are contained within the second database concurrently and persistently.

Saliba et al. teaches means for storing the first data value and the second data value in a second database such that the first data value from the first database and the second data value from the data source are contained within the second database concurrently and persistently (see paragraphs 0099-0102, and see figure 12b, where it is known in the art that pop emails are held on the local computer until they are deleted and web email is held in the web cache folder until it is replaced or removed).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Hogan by the teachings of Saliba et al. because means for storing the first data value and the second data value in a second database such that the first data value from the first database and the second data value from the data source are contained within the second database concurrently and persistently would allow the user to secure financial transactions using an email system that is already in use (see Saliba et al., abstract).

As to claim 32, Hogan as modified, teaches wherein the means for receiving the user identifier of the user includes a means for pre-qualifying a user (see Hogan, column 5, line 66 through column 6, line 20).

As to claim 33, Hogan as modified, teaches further comprising means for requesting user information (see Hogan, column 6, lines 1-8).

As to claim 37, Hogan teaches a method for database registration (see abstract), the method comprising:

a step for receiving a user identifier of a user (see column 5, line 66 through column 6, line 6);

a step for sending a query to a first database based at least in part on the user identifier (see column 6, lines 7-11);

a step for receiving a first data value from the first database, the first data value being associated with the user (see column 6, lines 11-13);

a step for receiving a second data value from a data source, the second data value being associated with the user, the data source being different from the first database (see column 7, lines 22-28); and

a step for storing the first data value and the second data value in a second database, the second database being different from the first database (see column 9, lines 40-53).

Hogan does not teach a step for storing the first data value and the second data value in a second database such that the first data value from the first database and the second data value

from the second data source are contained within the second database concurrently and persistently.

Saliba et al. teaches a step for storing the first data value and the second data value in a second database such that the first data value from the first database and the second data value from the second data source are contained within the second database concurrently and persistently (see paragraphs 0099-0102, and see figure 12b, where it is known in the art that pop emails are held on the local computer until they are deleted and web email is held in the web cache folder until it is replaced or removed).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Hogan by the teachings of Saliba et al. because a step for storing the first data value and the second data value in a second database such that the first data value from the first database and the second data value from the second data source are contained within the second database concurrently and persistently would allow the user to secure financial transactions using an email system that is already in use (see Saliba et al., abstract).

As to claim 38, Hogan as modified, teaches wherein the step for receiving the first data value from the first database includes a step for receiving a validated first data value from the first database (see Hogan, column 5, line 66 through column 6, line 20).

As to claim 41, Hogan teaches computer-readable medium storing a plurality of instructions to be executed by a processor for database registration (see abstract, and see figure 1), the plurality of instructions comprising instructions to:

receive a user identifier of a user (see column 5, line 66 through column 6, line 6);

send a query to a first database based at least in part on the user identifier (see column 6, lines 7-11);

receive a first data value of a first data field from the first database, the first data value being associated with the user (see column 6, lines 11-13);

receive a second data value from a data source, the second data value being associated with the user, the data source being different from the first database (see column 7, lines 22-28); and

store the first data value and the second data value in a second database, the second database being different from the first database (see column 9, lines 40-53).

Hogan does not teach store the first data value and the second data value in a second database such that the first data value from the first database and the second data value from the data source are contained within the second database concurrently and persistently.

Saliba et al. teaches store the first data value and the second data value in a second database such that the first data value from the first database and the second data value from the data source are contained within the second database concurrently and persistently (see paragraphs 0099-0102, and see figure 12b, where it is known in the art that pop emails are held on the local computer until they are deleted and web email is held in the web cache folder until it is replaced or removed).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Hogan by the teachings of Saliba et al. because store the first data value and the second data value in a second database such that the first data value from

the first database and the second data value from the data source are contained within the second database concurrently and persistently would allow the user to secure financial transactions using an email system that is already in use (see Saliba et al., abstract).

As to claim 42, Hogan as modified, teaches wherein the instructions to receive the first data value from the first database include instructions to receive a validated first data value from the first database (see Hogan, column 5, line 66 through column 6, line 20).

4. Claims 2-3, 31, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hogan (U.S. patent No. 5,692,132) in view of Saliba et al. (U.S. patent application publication No. 2001/0037315 A1) as applied to claims 1, 4, 20, 23, 30, 32-33, 37-38, and 41-42 above, and in further view of Gregory (U.S. patent No. 6,490,567 B1).

As to claim 2 and 31 Hogan as modified, still does not teach the method further comprising validating the second data value.

Gregory teaches separating the transaction functionality from the merchant's content (see abstract), in which he teaches the method further comprising validating the second data value (see column 9, lines 28-39).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Hogan as modified by the teachings of Gregory because the method further comprising validating the second data value would allow the product to be

shipped in the most expedient and efficient manner possible (see Gregory, column 9, lines 29-34).

As to claim 3, Hogan as modified, teaches wherein the first data value is a validated data value (see Hogan, column 5, line 66 through column 6, line 20).

As to claim 43, Hogan as modified, still does not teach further comprising instructions to validate the second data value.

Gregory teaches further comprising instructions to validate the second data value (see column 9, lines 28-39).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Hogan as modified by the teachings of Gregory because further comprising instructions to validate the second data value would allow the product to be shipped in the most expedient and efficient manner possible (see Gregory, column 9, lines 29-34).

5. Claims 5-6, 12-13, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hogan (U.S. patent No. 5,692,132) in view of Saliba et al. (U.S. patent application publication No. 2001/0037315 A1) as applied to claims 1, 4, 20, 23, 30, 32-33, 37-38, and 41-42 above, and in further view of Friesen (U.S. patent No. 6,636,863 B1).

As to claim 5, Hogan as modified, still does not teach further comprising sending at least in part an applet to the computer.

Friesen teaches a shopping cart that keeps track of quantity and prices of items selected without sending information back to the host server (see abstract), in which he teaches further comprising sending at least in part an applet to the computer (see abstract).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Hogan as modified by the teachings of Friesen because further comprising sending at least in part an applet to the computer would allow a shopping cart to be generated that keeps track of the quantity and prices of items without any interaction with the host server (see Friesen, abstract).

As to claim 6, Hogan as modified, teaches wherein sending at least in part the applet to the computer includes sending graphical user interface data (see Friesen, abstract).

As to claim 12, Hogan as modified, teaches further comprising storing a third data value in the second database, the third data value being associated with the user, the third data value being received from one of the data source and the first database (see Hogan column 9, lines 40-53).

Hogan as modified does not teach further comprising storing a fourth data value in the second database, the fourth data value being associated with the user, the fourth data value being received from one of the data source and the first database.

Friesen teaches further comprising storing a fourth data value in the second database, the fourth data value being associated with the user, the fourth data value being received from one of the data source and the first database (see column 10, line 65 through column 11, line 6).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Hogan as modified by the teachings of Friesen because further comprising storing a fourth data value in the second database, the fourth data value being associated with the user, the fourth data value being received from one of the data source and the first database would allow the vender to know where to ship the product.

As to claim 13, Hogan as modified, teaches further comprising selectively sending at least one of and less than all of the first data value, the second data value, the third data value, and the fourth data value (see Hogan, column 9, lines 54-67).

As to claim 21, Hogan as modified teaches wherein:

the first server includes a first server processor and a first server memory, the first server memory including a plurality of instructions configured to be executed by the server, the plurality of instructions configured to be executed by the server including the database registration instructions (see Hogan, column 6, lines 6-15); and

the computer includes a processor and a memory, the memory including a plurality of instructions configured to be executed by the processor, the plurality of instructions configured to be executed by the processor including at least a portion of the database registration instructions (see Hogan, column 5, lines 44-51).

Hogan as modified, does not teach the at least a portion of the database registration instructions being received from the first server.

Friesen teaches the at least a portion of the database registration instructions being received from the first server (see column 6, lines 25-39).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Hogan as modified, by the teachings of Friesen because the at least a portion of the database registration instructions being received from the first server would allow the client to run HTML pages with applets and Active X objects embedded (see Friesen, column 6, lines 25-39).

6. Claims 7-11, 24, 34, 36, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hogan (U.S. patent No. 5,692,132) in view of Saliba et al. (U.S. patent application publication No. 2001/0037315 A1) as applied to claims 1, 4, 20, 23, 30, 32-33, 37-38, and 41-42 above, and in further view of Ronen et al. (U.S. patent No. 5,905,736).

As to claim 7, Hogan as modified, still does not teach further comprising receiving purchasing card information.

Ronen et al. teaches billing transactions over the internet (see abstract), in which he teaches further comprising receiving purchasing card information (see column 4, lines 20-39).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Hogan as modified, by the teachings of Ronen et al.

because further comprising receiving purchasing card information would allow transactions to be billed (see Ronen et al., column 4, lines 20-25).

As to claim 8, Hogan as modified, teaches wherein the purchasing card information includes a purchasing card number of a purchasing card and an identification of an owner of the purchasing card (see Ronen et al., column 4, lines 50-60).

As to claim 9, Hogan as modified, teaches wherein the purchasing card is selected from the group consisting of a credit card and a debit card (see Ronen et al., column 4, lines 20-39).

As to claim 10, Hogan as modified, teaches wherein the owner of the purchasing card is different from the user (see Ronen et al., column 4, lines 50-60, where it is known in the art that the credit card issuer is the owner of the card).

As to claim 11, Hogan as modified, teaches further comprising sending an electronic communication to the owner of the purchasing card, the electronic communication related to determining whether the user is authorized to use the purchasing card (see Ronen et al., column 7, lines 61-67).

As to claim 24, Hogan as modified, still does not teach wherein:

the computer is to receive purchasing card information; and

the second database is to store the purchasing card information.

Ronen et al. teaches wherein: the computer is to receive purchasing card information (see column 4, lines 20-39); and the second database is to store the purchasing card information (see column 4, lines 40-47).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Hogan as modified, by the teachings of Ronen et al. because wherein: the computer is to receive purchasing card information; the second database is to store the purchasing card information would allow transactions to be billed (see Ronen et al., column 4, lines 20-25).

As to claim 34, Hogan as modified, still does not teach further comprising means for requesting purchasing card information.

Ronen et al. teaches further comprising means for requesting purchasing card information (see column 4, lines 20-39).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Hogan as modified, by the teachings of Ronen et al. because further comprising means for requesting purchasing card information would allow transactions to be billed (see Ronen et al., column 4, lines 20-25).

As to claim 36, Hogan as modified, teaches further comprising means for validating the purchasing card information (see Ronen et al., column 7, lines 61-67).

As to claim 39, Hogan as modified, still does not teach further comprising:

a step for receiving purchasing card information; and

a step for validating purchasing card information.

Ronen et al. teaches further comprising: a step for receiving purchasing card information (see column 4, lines 20-39); and a step for validating purchasing card information (see column 7, lines 61-67).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Hogan as modified, by the teachings of Ronen et al. because further comprising: a step for receiving purchasing card information; and a step for validating purchasing card information would allow transactions to be billed (see Ronen et al., column 4, lines 20-25).

7. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hogan (U.S. patent No. 5,692,132) in view of Gregory (U.S. patent No. 6,490,567) in further view of Bauer et al. (U.S. patent No. 5,870,759) and in further view of Saliba et al. (U.S. patent application publication No. 2001/0037315 A1).

As to claim 14, Hogan teaches a method for database registration (see abstract), the method comprising:

receiving a user identification of a user via a computer of a first information system (see column 5, line 66 though column 6, line 6);

sending a query to a first database of the first information system, the query based at least in part on the user identification (see column 6, lines 7-11);

receiving a first data value from the first database, the first data value being associated with the user (see column 6, lines 11-13);

receiving a second data value from the computer, the second data value being associated with the user (see column 7, lines 22-28);

storing the user identification, the first data value, and the second data value in a second database of the first information system, the second database being different from the first database (see column 9, lines 40-53).

Hogan does not teach validating the second data value.

Gregory teaches validating the second data value (see column 9, lines 28-39).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Hogan to include validating the second data value.

Hogan as modified, still does not teach sending the validated second data value and the first data value to a third database, the third database being different from the first database and the second database, the third database being part of a second information system, the second information system being different from the first information system.

Bauer et al. teaches synchronizing data between computers (see abstract), in which he teaches sending the validated second data value and the first data value to a third database, the third database being different from the first database and the second database, the third database being part of a second information system, the second information system being different from the first information system (see column 2, lines 7-24).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Hogan as modified, by the teachings of Bauer et al.

because sending the validated second data value and the first data value to a third database, the third database being different from the first database and the second database, the third database being part of a second information system, the second information system being different from the first information system would allow data to be shared among many nodes on the computing system (see Bauer et al., column 1, line 64 through column 2, line 6).

Hogan as modified, still does not teach storing the user identification, the first data value, and the second data value in a second database of the first information system such that the user identification, the first data value, and the second data value are stored within the second database concurrently and persistently.

Saliba et al. teaches storing the user identification, the first data value, and the second data value in a second database of the first information system such that the user identification, the first data value, and the second data value are stored within the second database concurrently and persistently (see paragraphs 0099-0102, and see figure 12b, where it is known in the art that pop emails are held on the local computer until they are deleted and web email is held in the web cache folder until it is replaced or removed).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Hogan by the teachings of Saliba et al. because storing the user identification, the first data value, and the second data value in a second database of the first information system such that the user identification, the first data value, and the second data value are stored within the second database concurrently and persistently would allow the user to secure financial transactions using an email system that is already in use (see Saliba et al., abstract).

8. Claims 15-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hogan (U.S. patent No. 5,692,132) in view of Gregory (U.S. patent No. 6,490,567) in further view of Bauer et al. (U.S. patent No. 5,870,759) and in further view of Saliba et al. (U.S. patent application publication No. 2001/0037315 A1) as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of Ronen et al. (U.S. patent No. 5,905,736).

As to claim 15, Hogan as modified, still does not teach further comprising:

receiving purchasing card information from the first computer; and

storing the purchasing card information in the second database.

Ronen et al. teaches further comprising: receiving purchasing card information from the first computer (see column 4, lines 20-39); and storing the purchasing card information in the second database (see column 4, lines 40-47).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Hogan as modified, by the teachings of Ronen et al. because further comprising: receiving purchasing card information from the first computer; and storing the purchasing card information in the second database would allow transactions to be billed (see Ronen et al., column 4, lines 20-25).

As to claim 16, Hogan as modified, teaches further comprising validating the purchasing card information (see Ronen et al., column 7, lines 61-67).

As to claim 17, Hogan as modified, teaches wherein the purchasing card information includes a purchasing card number and an identification of a purchasing card owner (see Ronen et al., column 4, lines 50-60).

As to claim 18, Hogan as modified, teaches wherein the purchasing card owner is different from the user (see Ronen et al., column 4, lines 50-60, where it is known in the art that the credit card issuer is the owner of the card).

As to claim 19, Hogan as modified, teaches further comprising sending a purchasing card validation query to the owner of the purchasing card, the purchasing card validation query including at least in part an identification of the user (see Ronen et al., column 7, lines 61-67).

9. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hogan (U.S. patent No. 5,692,132) in view of Saliba et al. (U.S. patent application Publication No. 2001/0037315 A1) in further view of Friesen (U.S. patent No. 6,636,863 B1) as applied to claims 5-6, 12-13, and 21 above, and further in view of Ronen et al. (U.S. patent No. 5,905,736).

As to claim 25, Hogan as modified, does not teach wherein:

the computer is to receive purchasing card information;

the second database is to store the purchasing card information; and

the database registration instructions include instructions to validate the purchasing card information.

Ronen et al. teaches wherein: the computer is to receive purchasing card information (see column 4, lines 20-39); the second database is to store the purchasing card information (see column 4, lines 40-47); and the database registration instructions include instructions to validate the purchasing card information (see Ronen et al., column 7, lines 61-67).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Hogan as modified, by the teachings of Ronen et al. because wherein: the computer is to receive purchasing card information; the second database is to store the purchasing card information; and the database registration instructions include instructions to validate the purchasing card information would allow transactions to be billed (see Ronen et al., column 4, lines 20-25).

10. Claims 26-27, and 44-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hogan (U.S. patent No. 5,692,132) in view of Bauer et al. (U.S. patent No. 5,870,759) in further view of Saliba et al. (U.S. patent application Publication No. 2001/0037315 A1).

As to claim 26, Hogan teaches a system for database registration (see abstract), the system comprising:

a first server of a first information system, the first server including database registration instructions and user data feed instructions (see column 5, line 66 through column 6, line 20);

a first database of the first information system, the first database coupled to the first server, the first database to store at least in part a first data value associated with a user (see column 6, lines 6-13);

a computer of the first information system, the computer coupled to the first server, the computer to receive a second data value associated with the user (see column 7, lines 22-28), the computer to receive the first data value from the first database (see column 6, lines 11-13); and

a second database of the first information system, the second database coupled to the computer, the second database to receive the first data value and the second data value from the computer, the second database to store the first data value and the second data value (see column 9, lines 40-53).

Hogan does not teach a second server coupled to the first server, the second server being part of a second information system, the second server including user data upload instructions; and a third database coupled to the second server, the third database being part of the second information system.

Bauer et al. teaches a second server coupled to the first server, the second server being part of a second information system, the second server including user data upload instructions (see column 2, lines 7-24); and a third database coupled to the second server, the third database being part of the second information system (see figure 1, reference number 12).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Hogan by the teachings of Bauer et al. because a second server coupled to the first server, the second server being part of a second information system, the second server including user data upload instructions; and a third database coupled to the second server, the third database being part of the second information system would allow data to be shared among many nodes on the computing system (see column 1, line 64 through column 2, line 6).

Hogan does not teach the second database to store the first data value and the second data value such that the first data value from the first database and the second data value are contained within the second database concurrently and persistently.

Saliba et al. teaches the second database to store the first data value and the second data value such that the first data value from the first database and the second data value are contained within the second database concurrently and persistently (see paragraphs 0099-0102, and see figure 12b, where it is known in the art that pop emails are held on the local computer until they are deleted and web email is held in the web cache folder until it is replaced or removed).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Hogan by the teachings of Saliba et al. because the second database to store the first data value and the second data value such that the first data value from the first database and the second data value are contained within the second database concurrently and persistently would allow the user to secure financial transactions using an email system that is already in use (see Saliba et al., abstract).

As to claim 27, Hogan as modified, teaches wherein the user data feed instructions include instructions to selectively send data from the second database to the third database (see Bauer et al., column 2, lines 7-24).

As to claim 44, Hogan does not teach further comprising instructions to selectively send data from the second database to the third database.

Bauer et al. teaches further comprising instructions to selectively send data from the second database to the third database (see column 2, lines 7-24).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Hogan by the teachings of Bauer et al. because further comprising instructions to selectively send data from the second database to the third database would allow data to be shared among many nodes on the computing system (see Bauer et al., column 1, line 64 through column 2, line 6).

As to claim 45, Hogan teaches system for database registration of an electronic procurement system (see abstract), the system comprising:

a first server including database registration instructions, the first server associated with an electronic procurement purchasing organization, the electronic procurement purchasing organizations including a plurality of users (see column 5, line 66 through column 6, line 6);

a first database coupled to the first server, the first database to store at least in part a first data value associated with a user of the plurality of users, the first database associated with the electronic procurement purchasing organization (see column 6, lines 6-13);

a computer coupled to the first server, the computer to receive a second data value associated with the user (see column 7, lines 22-28), the computer to receive the first data value from the first database (see column 6, lines 11-13); and

a second database coupled to the computer, the second database to receive the first data value and the second data value from the computer, the second database to store the first data

value and the second data value, the first database associated with the electronic procurement purchasing organization (see column 9, lines 40-53).

Hogan does not teach a third database coupled to the second database, the third database associated with an electronic procurement vendor.

Bauer et al. teaches a third database coupled to the second database, the third database associated with an electronic procurement vendor (see figure 1, and see column 2, lines 7-24).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Hogan by the teachings of Bauer et al. because a third database coupled to the second database, the third database associated with an electronic procurement vendor would allow data to be shared among many nodes on the computing system (see Bauer et al., column 1, line 64 through column 2, line 6).

Hogan does not teach the second database to store the first data value and the second data value such that the first data value from the first database and the second data value are contained within the second database concurrently and persistently.

Saliba et al. teaches the second database to store the first data value and the second data value such that the first data value from the first database and the second data value are contained within the second database concurrently and persistently (see paragraphs 0099-0102, and see figure 12b, where it is known in the art that pop emails are held on the local computer until they are deleted and web email is held in the web cache folder until it is replaced or removed).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Hogan by the teachings of Saliba et al. because the second

database to store the first data value and the second data value such that the first data value from the first database and the second data value are contained within the second database concurrently and persistently would allow the user to secure financial transactions using an email system that is already in use (see Saliba et al., abstract).

11. Claims 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hogan (U.S. patent No. 5,692,132) in view of Bauer et al. (U.S. patent No. 5,870,759) in further view of Saliba et al. (U.S. patent application Publication No. 2001/0037315 A1) as applied to claims 26-27 and 44-45 above, and further in view of Friesen (U.S. patent No. 6,636,863 B1).

As to claim 28, Hogan as modified, teaches wherein the second database is to store a third data value, the third data value being associated with the user, the third data value being received from one of the computer and the first database (see Hogan, column 9, lines 40-53).

Hogan as modified, does not teach wherein the second database is to store a fourth data value, the fourth data value being associated with the user, the fourth data value being received from one of the computer and the first database.

Friesen teaches wherein the second database is to store a fourth data value, the fourth data value being associated with the user, the fourth data value being received from one of the computer and the first database (see column 10, line 65 through column 11, line 6).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Hogan as modified, by the teachings of Friesen because wherein the second database is to store a fourth data value, the fourth data value being associated

with the user, the fourth data value being received from one of the computer and the first database would allow the vender to know where to ship the product.

As to claim 29, Hogan as modified, teaches wherein user data feed instructions include instructions to selectively send at least one of and less than all of the first data value, the second data value, the third data value, and the fourth data value to the third database (see Bauer et al., column 4, lines 59-67).

12. Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hogan (U.S. patent No. 5,692,132) in view of Saliba et al. (U.S. patent application Publication No. 2001/0037315 A1) in further view of Ronen et al. (U.S. patent No. 5,905,736) as applied to claims 7-11, 24, 34, 36, and 39 above, and further in view of Friesen (U.S. patent No. 6,636,863 B1).

As to claim 35, Hogan as modified, still does not teach further comprising means for requesting shipping information.

Friesen teaches further comprising means for requesting shipping information (see column 10, line 65 through column 11, line 6).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Hogan as modified, by the teachings of Friesen because further comprising means for requesting shipping information would allow the vendor to know where to ship the product.

13. Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hogan (U.S. patent No. 5,692,132 in view of Ronen et al. (U.S. patent No. 5,905,736) as applied to claims 7-11, 24, 34, 36, and 39 above, and further in view of Bauer et al. (U.S. patent No. 5,870,759).

As to claim 40, Hogan as modified, still does not teach further comprising a step for selectively sending data from the second database to a third database.

Bauer et al. teaches further comprising a step for selectively sending data from the second database to a third database (see column 2, lines 7-24).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Hogan as modified, by the teachings of Bauer et al. because further comprising a step for selectively sending data from the second database to a third database would allow data to be shared among many nodes on the computing system (see Bauer et al., column 1, line 64 through column 2, line 6).

Response to Arguments

14. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-21 and 22-45 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

15. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jacob F. Betit whose telephone number is (571) 272-4075. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9 am to 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici can be reached on (571) 272-4083. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

jfb
9 Jan 2005